



**University of
Zurich**^{UZH}

**Zurich Open Repository and
Archive**

University of Zurich
University Library
Strickhofstrasse 39
CH-8057 Zurich
www.zora.uzh.ch

Year: 2016

Linking authorship and reviewing activity in science publishing

Clauss, Marcus

Abstract: Everybody wants to publish, but peers for review are increasingly hard to find. Online systems that help journal editors handle submissions indicate how many invitations for review a person accepted or declined. Linking this information automatically to the names of the first and last author of any submission to a specific journal, and displaying it during the online submission process, would make submitters aware of their own reviewing history with this journal, and make them aware that the journal editor will also be automatically informed about this. Editors might justifiably be less inclined to allow a manuscript into review if the authors have a history of declining review invitations. Additionally, offering both authors and editors a ranking opportunity in the online system as commonplace with any online business ('how do you rate this review?' - corrected for the type of decision that is rated) would make submitters aware of their reviewing performance, as well as editors - at the time when submitters might want to make the best of impressions with editors, i.e. during submission of their own manuscript. Rather than rewarding reviewing activity by quantifying it in metrics, such practice might enhance effort put into peer review.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.60164>

Posted at the Zurich Open Repository and Archive, University of Zurich

ZORA URL: <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-125669>

Journal Article

Accepted Version



The following work is licensed under a Creative Commons: Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) License.

Originally published at:

Clauss, Marcus (2016). Linking authorship and reviewing activity in science publishing. Journal of Brief Ideas:online.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.60164>

Linking authorship and reviewing activity in science publishing


By *Marcus Clauss* (/users/4d0cce66fe7485ba781838321b99940c)

- peer review (/search?tags=peer+review)
- authorship (/search?tags=authorship)
- online submission (/search?tags=online+submission)

Everybody wants to publish, but peers for review are increasingly hard to find. Online systems that help journal editors handle submissions indicate how many invitations for review a person accepted or declined. Linking this information automatically to the names of the first and last author of any submission to a specific journal, and displaying it during the online submission process, would make submitters aware of their own reviewing history with this journal, and make them aware that the journal editor will also be automatically informed about this. Editors might justifiably be less inclined to allow a manuscript into review if the authors have a history of declining review invitations. Additionally, offering both authors and editors a ranking opportunity in the online system as commonplace with any online business ('how do you rate this review?' - corrected for the type of decision that is rated) would make submitters aware of their reviewing performance, as well as editors - at the time when submitters might want to make the best of impressions with editors, i.e. during submission of their own manuscript. Rather than rewarding reviewing activity by quantifying it in metrics, such practice might enhance effort put into peer review.

Comments

Please log in to add a comment.

 Sign in with ORCID (/auth/orcid)

- 0
- 0


Authors


Marcus Clauss
(http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3841-6207)

Metadata

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.60164
(http://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.60164)

Published: 15 Aug, 2016

 BY
(https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode)

 · Recent ideas (/ideas.atom)